

Remarks

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27-30 are rejected.

Claims 21 and 26 are objected to.

The drawings are accepted.

Claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15-20, 22-25 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by DuBois (US 6,793,460).

DuBois discloses a foldable sign upon which may be printed or written letters and numbers. In addition, LEDs may be added to the sign for illumination. The sign of DuBois is not display as mentioned in the specification. See the specification, Paragraphs 0035 and 0036, for example.

In order to further the progress of the application, and to clarify that the invention as claimed is a display device, not a sign, Applicants have amended claims 1, 23, 29 and 30 to include ‘addressable display elements.’ Claim 15 already included this limitation. This is not shown, taught or suggested by the prior art. The use of LEDs for illumination is not the same as addressable display elements.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1-8, 11, 12, 15-20, 22-25 and 27-30 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 9, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuBois in view of Latocha et al (US 5,790,371).

Claims 9, 13 and 14 depend from claim 1, and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, DuBois does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. The addition of

Latocha does not overcome this deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claims 9, 13 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuBois in view of Comishkey et al (US 6,473,072).

Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and inherently includes all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim. The addition of Comishkey does not overcome this deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 21 and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten. As claim 23 is now in allowable form, these claims are no longer dependent upon a rejected base claim and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not deemed pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 65650

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

210 SW Morrison Street
Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613